

**From:** Texpop@aol.com@inetgw  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/3/02 7:58pm  
**Subject:** Microsoft AntiTrust Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam,

This AntiTrust Action by the government has gone on too long already; let's close this action and carry on with progress.

I am disturbed that some litigants in this case want to prolong the legal process.

Microsoft did indeed overstep the bounds of fair competition in some of their agreements with hardware suppliers, but the solution to that problem could have been resolved many years ago by addressing the unfair practices and stopping them. Instead the competitors enlisted the government to resolve their grievances at no cost to them. These competitors had legal recourse of their own in the court system if they wanted to pursue it.

The complaint about bundling software was and remains specious and against the benefits to the consumer. For example, Netscape's programs could run on Windows. How is that possible? It is because Microsoft gave them all the information needed to program their software to run on Windows. That is not the action of a company trying to deny use of their system. I have yet to hear anyone complain about the cost of Windows and other Microsoft products, so where has the consumer been hurt? The bundling of software is one of the profound advances in system operating systems. This is one of the profound improvements in computer software developments.

Note that Microsoft has been very helpful financially and technically to one of its arch rivals, Apple. Microsoft has maintained Word and Excel software on Macintosh, even though they probably have not made much money for their effort.

I do not understand what the States (and their lawyers) have to gain by rejecting this settlement. Are they more interested in a large financial settlement or a resumption of the economic growth of the technical industry? I think it is the former!

James R. Lloyd  
514 Whitewing Lane  
Houston, TX 77079  
texpop@aol.com